



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/244,270	02/03/1999	LORDSON L. YUE	M-7019-US	3568

7590 02/12/2002

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
222 NORTH LaSALLE STREET  
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

CHUNG, DANIEL J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/244,270

Applicant(s)

YUE ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel J Chung

Art Unit

2672

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 January 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant's arguments filed 1-23-2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1-3, Applicant argued that the cited reference do not disclose that "generating the initial rasterization starting point estimate based on the region bit". (See Remake p.2 line 26-29, p. 3 line 1-2, p. 3 line 24-29) However, Lentz et al clearly discloses that the step[1110] of selecting a pixel["starting point"] to begin rasterization of triangle. (See Fig 4A, 4B, Fig 9, Fig 11A) Specifically, in the teaching of Lentz, the starting point is determined by the single-pixel traversal algorithm, which is performed based on the value["region bit"] of the edge variable at this pixel["tile"]. (See col 10 line 31-59, col 11 line 57-67) Applicant mentioned that the initial point to start rasterization is not a considerate in Lentz, due to method for determining the order of traversal are not discussed. (See Remarks p.3 line 5-11) However, the step of determining the order of traversal are nothing to do with determining the starting point[using single pixel traversal algorithm], as explicitly described in the teaching of Lentz by selecting a pixel for rasterization. (See col 10 line 31-59, col 11 line 57-67) It is respectfully required that Applicant need to recite more feature of invention which applicant relies (i.e. the method for estimating rasterization starting point of triangle [Fig 2 of application]) in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claims 4-6, Applicant argued that the cited reference do not disclose that "the initial rasterization starting point estimation circuit including a circuit for discarding a triangle when the corresponding vertex data lies outside a boundary defined by the region bits." (See Remarks p.4 line 12-14) However, discarding a primitive, which is located outside of tile, is well-known art in order to eliminate the cost and time for unnecessary processing[information that will not contribute to the display] (Also See previously cited reference (pto-892) *Grossman et al* U.S 6,246,415) Also, the clipping process of Wong or Lentz, which clip the part of a triangle[120 in Wong;1220 in Lentz] outside of tile[52 in Wong;1210 in Lentz], shows the functionally equivalent to "discarding a triangle outside of tile", as broadly claimed by applicant.

Regarding claim 7-13, dependent claims are rejected by dependency, also see the above argument and previous rejections.

Regarding claim 14-17, see the above argument and previous rejections.



MATTHEW LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER